UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/698,668	10/31/2003	Robert Ledingham	6486.P003	1021

7590   06/06/2006

James C. Scheller, Jr.
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER
LEE, WILSON

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2163	

DATE MAILED: 06/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/698,668	LEDINGHAM ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Wilson Lee	2163	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding Claim 1, line 6, "the first database" lacks antecedent basis whether it refers to a database or the first database server.

Regarding Claim 9, "ODBC" is not defined in the claim. It is vague because it could mean anything.

Regarding Claim 14, line 5, " the first" is vague because it does not define what "first".

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feik (6,850,913).

Regarding Claim 1, Feik discloses a database architecture (See Figure 3) for information display system comprising:

- a data manager (64) including a first interface (62);

- a first database server (54) connected to the data manager via the first

  interface;

- a firewall (52) connected to the first database server (54); and

- a second database server (20) connected to the first database server (54) via

  the firewall (52) and including a stored procedure (web pages of certifying

  organizations) for copying (e.g. downloading) data (search requests, HTML,

  naming and directory) (See claim 31, Col. 2, lines 7-49, Col. 10, line 64 to

  Col. 13, line 30) from the first database server (54).

Feik also discloses that such database management system is well known being

used in the area of air and space travel. Although Feil does not explicitly mention the

air traffic but it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize the

system of Feik for display air traffic information such as an flight delay, flight arrival and

departure, weather at the airports, etc.

Regarding Claim 2, Feik discloses that updating information (logging changes to

current data) (See Col. 2, lines 7-49 and Figures 3 and 4). Although Feik does not

explicitly disclose tables, however, table inherently exists in any database system

including Feik in order to store the data in binary format.

Regarding Claim 14, Feik discloses a method of (see Figure 3) storing

information comprising the steps of:

- receiving a data update request (from PC 20);

- changing the data (updating information) in accordance with the request (Col.

  2, lines 7-49);

- storing the changed data (into web database) in a first database server(54)

 (See Figures 3 and 4); and

- copying the changed data (copy and paste) to second database server (PC

 20) separated from the first database-server (54) by a firewall (52).

Feik also discloses that such database management system is well known being

used in the area of air and space travel. Although Feik does not explicitly mention the

air traffic but it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize the

system of Feik for display air traffic information such as an flight delay, flight arrival and

departure, weather at the airports, etc.

Regarding Claims 3, 4, 6, 17, 18, 20, 21, as discussed above, although Feik

does not explicitly mention the air traffic, flight data, or airport system but it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize the system of Feik for display air

traffic information such as an flight delay, flight arrival and departure, weather at the

airports, etc.

Regarding Claims 5, 7-13, 15, 16, 19, 23-26, Feik does not explicitly disclose

tables, however, table inherently exists in any database system including Feik in order

to store the data in binary format.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure. Mohammadioun et al. (2004/0044674) discloses a system and

method for parsing itinerary data. Mankoff (6,868,426) discloses a virtual document

organizer system and method. Kurganov et al. (6,721,705) discloses a robust voice

browser system. Kay et al. (6,430,602) discloses a method and system for interactively responding to instant messaging requests.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Wilson Lee whose telephone number is (571) 272-1824.

Papers related to Technology Center 2800 applications may be submitted to Technology Center 2800 by facsimile transmission. Any transmission not to be considered an official response must be clearly marked "DRAFT". The official fax number is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

5/29/06

WILSON LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER